

LOOKS DOUBTFUL

Committee Listen to Sugar Tariff Talk

PROTECTION AND BOUNTY THE CRY

Oxnard Wants Reciprocity Treaty Abrogated.

Beet Sugar Industry in the United States Needs Protection and Bounty.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 30.—The third day of the tariff hearings was devoted to the sugar schedule. Four interests were represented, the importers, the cane growers, the beet raisers and the refiners. The importers were heard first. John Farr of New York opened the argument. Their recommendations, presented by Mr. Farr, were:

First—On all sugar testing 75 degrees or less a duty of 1 cent per pound, adding 3 cents per degree to 100 degrees.

Second—An additional duty of about a fourth of a cent differential on all sugars above 100 degrees in color, to prevent refined sugars entering refined sugars at the same duties as raw sugars of the same test.

Third—An additional discriminating duty on all sugars from the bounty-paying countries, with authority to the President to raise or lower the duties on goods from those countries as bounties were raised or lowered.

This scheme, the importers estimated, would yield the Government a revenue of \$5,000,000 a year, the amount of sugar paying duty being about a half million tons, and the average polariscope test being 75 degrees.

In reply to a question, Farr declared that there was no undervaluation of sugar now imported, but owing to the strict interpretation of the law by custom house officials, the tendency was to pay more duty than the law called for. Appraisals were made on the basis of estimated values at Trinidad and other places where there was no market value.

"What would you say," said Mr. Dingley to the statement furnished by Henry Brown of Massachusetts that the invoice value of all sugar imported in 1893 was an average of 3-10 of a cent a pound under the London valuation?

Mr. Farr considered that statement untruthful and entirely theoretical. London values were not representative, as Germany had absorbed the business. London prices on cane were merely nominal.

Farr was questioned by Payne of New York on the effect of the operation of the American Refining Company on the business. The importer asserted that only occasional bargains could the American Sugar Refining Company buy its goods cheaper than other firms. Its influence had been to reduce the price of sugar throughout the world. Under the present differential rate of 3-10 of a cent the importations for the last year had been 65,000,000 tons larger than ever before. A differential of 1-4 of a cent a pound could enable the soft white sugar to compete with the centrifugal refiners.

Solomon Humphreys of New York, the chairman of the committee appointed by the sugar trade to investigate the effect of an ad valorem tariff on sugar and made a plea for a specific system. The change, he said, was unanimously demanded by the trade. Ad valorem duties are unjust on account of the fluctuations in prices. The sugar schedule had given the Treasury Department more trouble than any other feature of the tariff act now in force. It had been estimated by the department that it would yield a revenue of \$4,500,000, but for the past year the revenue has been less than \$3,000,000, and under existing conditions it would not exceed \$2,500,000 for the current year.

Higher prices for raw sugars would undoubtedly be the result of the schedule desired. Mr. Humphreys continued, but the advance would be so small that it would not be felt by the average family. A duty beginning at three-fourths of a cent at 75 degrees would yield \$4,000,000 revenue. The production of sugar was now regulated by consumption, and no reduction in prices could be expected for several years.

Speaking of bounties, Humphreys declared that they were a demoralizing factor in the sugar business of the world. The German Government recently had raised the bounty to something over one-fourth of a cent a pound, which enabled Germany to dispose of all her surplus product. The system was working ruin to all the British islands, so that they must resort to the bounty system or out of the business. Instead of one-tenth of a cent on bounty sugar imported into this country, the additional duty should be equal to the bounty.

P. J. Smith, an importer, made a brief argument against ad valorem duties. Colonel J. D. Hill of New York, representing the American Association of Louisiana, was the first to speak for the producers. He argued for a restoration of the duty of the act of 1853. He spoke of the situation produced by the bounty act of 1890, with the duty imposed thereon on refined sugar, and finally said if a similar provision could be made in the prospective law, and its permanency guaranteed, the sugar producers would prefer it; but all things considered, they asked for a re-enactment of the provisions of the act of 1853. He produced figures to show the reduction in the price of refined sugar under the operation of that act at the time when crops were being marketed, to show the benefits to the country at large from home competition.

In answer to a question by Johnson of North Dakota, Colonel Hill expressed the opinion that with the protection asked the cane and beet sugar industries of the United States could produce enough sugar to supply the consumption of this country. He further declared that he had not the slightest doubt, if the bounty of 1890 had been continued during the term of years provided for, the sugar growers would have supplied the consumption by the time the bounty period expired.

The cane growers asked:

First—That specific duties dependent on both polariscope test and color standard be imposed in lieu of ad valorem duties.

Second—That, commencing with 1.40 cts. for sugar testing 75 and under 15, Dutch standard, the rate be proportionately increased.

Third—That duties equal to export bounties be imposed to offset them.

Fourth—A proportionate duty on molasses.

Fifth—That the new law have effect from the passage of the act.

Sixth—That reciprocity treaties, if they are adopted, be without injury to the domestic sugar industry, on lines which recognize the overshadowing importance of developing sugar production in the United States, and by such methods as insure a protection equivalent to that suggested.

J. H. Sypher of this city was called by Chairman Dingley, and gave it as his opinion that the cost of refining in Louisiana would perhaps reach three-eighths of 1 cent.

Mr. Humphreys was recalled and asked the cost of refining sugar, but he said he did not care to set his opinion against actual refiners. He thought, however, in a general way, that the cost of refining sugars testing 96 degrees was about as stated by Mr. Sypher, but sugar of lower grade, with more impurities, would, of course, be much higher. For instance, it would cost 1 cent to refine sugar of 85 degrees.

Henry T. Oxnard of Red Island, Neb., president of the American Beet Sugar Association, in behalf of the industry, declared that the present tariff not only failed to give protection to the sugar raisers, but discouraged the investment of additional capital. It has been predicted that under the McKinley law the beet sugar industry would grow rapidly, and three refineries had been built in the administration of that law, but since then the changes had deterred new investments. Any schedule on sugar which had been in force since 1893, except that of the Wilson tariff, would permit the increase of beet sugar growing. Beet sugar could be produced in twenty States, and under a proper tariff the United States could in fifteen years raise all the sugar necessary for home consumption. The beet industry protected against rates lower than 1-4 to 3-10 cents a pound.

Oxnard delivered an argument in favor of a bounty, and proceeded to quote departmental reports and other authorities to show that the country had the climate and the capital required for the production of all its own sugar. Every other nation, even Sweden, which could supply itself with sugar, had taken every measure to do so. Even little Bulgaria had liberal duties and bounties enforced for this purpose.

The cost of labor, uncertainty as to legislation, export bounties in other countries, and the decline in prices were all operating to keep capital out of investment in beet sugar. Germany now pays 20-25 cents per hundred pounds of quality of the sugar, and could afford to sell sugar in New York at 12-15 cents per hundred pounds less than the American producers, and occasionally to sell surplus products below the cost. Give America a reasonable bounty, guaranteed to continue for a reasonable time, and it would work wonders. The American producer is obliged to compete with African cheap labor, as Egypt in the last fiscal year had sent \$2,250,000 worth of sugar to the United States. In British bottoms, which receive no return cargo. With war in Cuba and the Philippines, cutting off supplies from those islands, Germany was endeavoring to take the American market. For reasons supposedly commercial, Congress had in 1875 legislated for the free entry of sugar from Hawaii. The treaty had never been ratified, but the people had cost \$8,000,000, and had not greatly increased our exports to that country. The estimated duties remitted by the United States on Hawaiian sugar are \$61,000,000.

He thought it was unjust to encourage these importers at the expense of our own and home producers. He urged the abrogation of the agreement.

Speaking of the conflicting interests involved in giving adequate protection to the sugar growers, he pointed to the sugar refiners who bought and refined the foreign product, and to the millers of four and others who directed the sugar in reciprocity agreements to obtain concessions for themselves. The refiners wanted the lowest possible duties on raw and the highest on refined. While, owing to the condition of the treasury, it might not be feasible to re-enact the bounty scheme of 1890, he thought the dual system proposed by the Senate amendments to the Mills bill, which imposed a duty and also gave a bounty, was now entirely practicable.

Oxnard took strong grounds against any reciprocity. He thought a dual policy (both duty and bounty) would be fair to all interests and jeopardize none. Such a policy, he said, would increase the revenue out of which the bounty could be paid, and would encourage the sugar industry. The schedule he proposed was a duty of 1 cent per pound on all sugars testing 75 degrees or less, 3 cents per hundred pounds additional for sugars between 76 and 100, and with one-fourth of 1 cent differential on sugars above 15, Dutch standard. He asked for the McKinley duty on molasses. The bounty he proposed was three-fourths of a cent per pound, one-fourth to go off at the end of each year, the whole bounty to cease in twelve years.

"Do you believe that a bounty would be permanent?" asked Payne. "You remember in 1884 you opposed it on the ground that it could not be made permanent."

"Yes," replied Oxnard, "I think it would be permanent, because I believe the Republican party will continue in power."

"Why?" asked Wheeler. "Because it has no other prospect?"

Oxnard did not reply to this, nor to Payne when he asked facetiously if he believed this because of the encouragement given the Egyptian party by the best sugar States and the close squeeze in the Senate.

Oxnard, in answer to questions from Mr. Hill, said that the Eastern and Western refiners had divided the American market between them and agreed not to infringe on each other's territory, the Hawaiian treaty helping that agreement.

Senator Perkins of California presented an argument in favor of the imposition of a specific tax of one and a half cents on imported raw sugars. He showed that the consumption of imported sugar by the United States is about 1,700,000 pounds a year, all of which, if protected, he said, can be produced in a few years within our borders. He showed that the acreage capable of producing beet sugar was sufficient to more than supply the demand for the United States, and that sugar could be raised on soil of the same character from the alkali plains in Utah to the rich soil of California.

Herbert Myrick, president of the Orange Juice Company, spoke in the interest of the farmer. His argument was exhaustive and was largely devoted to showing the advantages of the production in this country of the sugar consumed here.

Thomas B. Corder of Utah, a Bishop of the Mormon church, read statistics of imports and exports between the United States and Hawaii, showing that the exports from the United States are but 11.4 per cent of the imports, and that \$4,557,000 of duties are related to the Hawaiian producers. The sugar imported from Hawaii would give employment in the United States to 48,000 men continuously throughout the year.

"Utah has felt the hand of the Sugar Trust," he said. "The moment Utah tries to get into its own market the American Sugar Company of San Francisco reduces the price in Utah so that we have to accept less than the price sugar is selling for in San Francisco."

R. M. Allen of Ames, Neb., spoke in behalf of the farmers of the trans-Mississippi country.

During the morning session Francis B. Thurber of New York and W. J. McCann of Philadelphia also spoke. Both were subjected to a vigorous cross-questioning by McMillan on the operations of the Sugar Trust.

The committee adjourned until tomorrow at 10 a. m.

SPECKELS-WATSON.

Miss Emma Married Quietly to Grain Merchant.

SAN FRANCISCO, Jan. 8.—Thos. Watson, a grain merchant well and popularly known as "Change," was united in marriage on Wednesday last to Miss Emma Speckels, daughter of Chas. Speckels, the multi-millionaire sugar king.

The wedding was a quiet one. In fact it was solemnized away from San Francisco and without the knowledge of any great number of the friends of either party.

As one of the heirs to the Speckels millions it might have been expected that her wedding would be superlatively the social event of the season. Her position in society was such that her many friends would be surprised to learn that the wedding was an unostentatious affair as it was possible for a wedding to be. There were no bridesmaids, no elaborate wedding trousseau, no costly presents, no wedding breakfast, no reception.

The affair was not even preceded by any formal announcement, and it remained for the friends of the bridegroom to make public the fact yesterday.

The wedding ceremony was performed on Wednesday afternoon last at Trinity Episcopal Church vestry in San Jose by the rector, Rev. J. B. Wakenfield, D. D.

The Chronicle of January 7 says: Since Miss Emma Speckels became Mrs. Thomas Watson no member of the Speckels family has called upon her, and from none of them has come a message of congratulation.

Mrs. Watson shows her magnificent independence of material help from her parents by returning to her father property valued at about a million and a half pounds, given to her from time to time.

Notwithstanding this transfer to her father of the evidences of title to these properties of vast value, Mrs. Watson need not be dependent entirely upon the revenues of her husband from the brokerage business. She still owns the fine block on Market street known as the Emma Speckels building, and the lot on which the building stands, and also some other property. The possessions of Mrs. Watson remaining after the present to her father are valued at \$400,000 and more, and the annual revenue is about \$30,000.

SUGAR DROPS

Western Refining Company Yields to Over-production.

The Western Sugar Refining Company, of which John D. Spreckels is president and Robert Oxnard is secretary, announced yesterday a reduction of half a cent a pound in the eight highest grades of the article, says the Examiner of January 5. The reduced price affects California and the Pacific coast generally. The drop in the price is due to large overproduction of the sugar cane industry in Cuba on account of the rebellion in progress there made people believe the world's supply would fall off greatly and give sugar a very high price. This was the general opinion in Europe, and together with the bounties offered in some parts of Europe for the production of beet sugar, it is believed that the price of sugar will decline much from the present figures.

"There is a second factor which has also lowered our price of sugar," said Mr. Oxnard, "the Hong Kong article is made from cane by the very cheap labor of China. Just enough is coming here to disturb the market."

Mr. Oxnard did not think the price of sugar would decline much from the present figures.

TREATY WITH JAPAN.

United States Preparing to Open Its Doors.

NEW YORK, Jan. 4.—The Herald's special from Washington says:

Negotiations were practically concluded today by Secretary Olney and Japanese Minister Tani Hoshi, by which Article 16 of the treaty for commerce and navigation between the United States and Japan, concluded in 1894, to become operative in 1896, will go into effect immediately. This article provides for the opening of the territories of each nation shall enjoy in the territories of the other the same protection as native citizens or subjects in regard to patents, trade marks and designs, upon the fulfillment of the formalities as prescribed by law.

The treaty is one of a series which Japan has been concluding during the past two years with all European countries except Spain and Portugal, and with several South American countries, all of which become operative in 1896. Germany has just ratified for commerce and navigation an article regarding patents, trade marks and designs, and Japanese envoys at the various courts of Europe are negotiating for similar provisions on the same footing as Japanese, except that land must be leased and cannot be purchased, and makes the inhabitants of either nation amenable to the laws of the country in which they happen to be.

PROPOSED PACIFIC CABLE.

London Conference Will Recommend Its Construction.

LONDON, Jan. 5.—The Pacific Cable Conference will meet within a fortnight to sign a report already agreed upon. It is semi-officially stated that the report unanimously recommends that the cable be built, as it is practically feasible and commercially and politically necessary.

There is some difference of opinion regarding the relative share of expense to be borne by Great Britain and the Colonies, but the delegates agreed finally to recommend that the cable be built by Great Britain and more by the Colonies than was originally considered necessary. The sum asked from Great Britain is understood to be considered financially feasible by Secretary Chamberlain.

Steamship Goes Down.

BREST, Jan. 6.—The steamship Belgrade, bound from Antwerp for Bayonne, France, was wrecked last night on Cat's Head rocks. Fifteen of the eighteen persons on board were drowned.

A PACIFIC CABLE

Completion of Details at London, England.

LILUOKALANI IS IN BOSTON

Death of Rear Admiral Skerrett, U. S. N.

End of an Honorable Career—Voluntarily Retired From the Navy.

NEW YORK, Jan. 6.—A copyrighted cablegram from London to the Evening Post says: The drafts of the Pacific Cable Commission were signed this afternoon on behalf of the British, Australian and Canadian governments after many months' investigation.

The result, which is kept strictly secret for the present, is awaited with keen interest as the first tangible product of Joseph Chamberlain's aggressive colonial policy, an important step towards establishing British supremacy in the Pacific and supplying the empire with an imperial cable free from foreign interference. It is understood the report favors laying a cable at the earliest possible moment between Vancouver and Australia, under joint subsidy by England and Canada, certain of the Australian colonies and New Zealand. It must touch nothing but British territory, leaving Hawaii to be tapped by a branch line. The Laurier government made Canadian support absolutely conditional upon the absence of foreign stations, which would destroy the strategic value of the cable to the empire in case of war.

The Canadian delegates strongly favored the construction and operation of the cable as a joint government enterprise by an imperial colonial cable trust of England, Canada and Australia, paying a third of the cost each.

English official opinion, supported by some of the Australian colonies and backed by strenuous opposition to the existing eastern company monopoly, favored a subsidy to an independent company, which course will be adopted probably.

The cable will cost about \$10,000,000, to be put down and be ready within two years. The project now awaits the approval of the imperial legislatures. The only difficulty expected is in Australia, where intercolonial rivalries are certain to create opposition.

LONDON, Jan. 7.—The Chronicle announces that the Pacific Cable Commission has finally signed its report. It says that the lowest tender for a Fanning Island cable ranged from \$1,577,000 to \$1,880,000, according to whether a 12, 15 or 18-wire per minute cable is laid.

GIVEN NEW YEAR GREETINGS. Liluokalani Tendered Compliments of the Season.

A delightful reception was that held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. William Lee, on Beacon street, Brookline, yesterday, ex-Queen Liluokalani being the guest of honor, says the Boston Herald of Jan. 2.

The old colonial mansion house was filled with guests from 3 to 5 o'clock. The receiving party formed a pretty picture, as, grouped in the bay window, it greeted with charming cordiality the many friends who called. In the party were ex-Queen Liluokalani, Mrs. Lee, Mrs. K. N. Nohole, Mr. Lee, Miss Lee, Mr. J. Halehu and Capt. Julius Palmer. The ushers were Misses Flora and Donalena MacDonal and Mr. Frank M. Goss.

The house was richly decorated with flowers. Music was rendered by Miss Sarah MacDonald, harpist.

The ex-Queen wore a gown of black velvet, with thread lace garniture, caught with jewels. The badge of the Mystic Shrine was prominent. Mrs. Lee wore a costume of French gray and lace, with a bracelet of gold on her arm, presented to her by her guest as a token of friendship. Mr. Lee wore a New Year's gift from the ex-Queen, a heart-shaped pin of pearl, with center of amethyst.

ADMIRAL SKERRETT DEAD.

United States Naval Officer Well Known in Honolulu.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 1, 1897.

Rear Admiral Joseph S. Skerrett, U. S. N., retired, died at his residence in this city last night.

Rear Admiral Skerrett was an Ohio man, and was appointed from that state in 1848. In that year and until 1852 he was attached to the razeed Independence of the Mediterranean squadron. He was on the sloop Marion from 1852 to 1854, as a midshipman and navigator and watch officer, with station on the coast of Africa, where a squadron was located in those days. He was made a passed midshipman in 1854, having passed at the head of his class. The following year he was promoted to be master, and at the same

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

In 1862 he was commissioned a lieutenant commander, and for a year or more was stationed on ordnance duty at the Washington Navy Yard. In 1863 he was attached to the Shenandoah as executive officer. It was not until 1864 that he actively took part in the great conflict, though when the war broke out he asked to be placed in command of a ship befitting his rank of lieutenant commander. In that year he was given command of the gunboat Aroostook, and engaged with the rebel fortifications at the mouth of the Brazos river in Texas in June, 1864.

After the war he was placed in command of the apprentice ship Portsmouth as a commander. He was on duty at the naval academy from 1868

time was commissioned a lieutenant, with duty on the frigate Potomac, on what was then known as the home squadron.

From 1856 to 1859 he was on board the Falmouth on the Brazilian coast, and from 1860 to 1862 he was again on the African coast, with duty on board the sloop Saratoga.

Superior Court Judge Charles E. Rice of Wilkesbarre, Pa.

Senator Quay's term expires in March, 1899, and according to Wanamaker's followers the business men will continue their organization with the object of defeating Quay should he be a candidate for re-election. The Legislature will ratify the caucus selection of Mr. Penrose on January 24th.

MAICO ALIVE AGAIN.

Report that He Was Only Wounded and Is Recovering.

NEW YORK, Dec. 30.—A Herald special from Key West says:

The startling information came by steamer tonight that Maico was alive. It was received by waiting Cubans on the wharf with joyful shouts and is given some credence. The first rumors of his death, which were received with incredulity, are being dissipated by news reaching Havana lately giving accurate details.

It is now stated that when he fell from his horse his followers thought he was dead, but afterwards found that he was still alive, and spread the report that he was dead in order to carry his body off in safety. Under a strong suspicion of being a spy, he was carried to Siguanay hospital, where, under the skillful treatment of Drs. Valdes Dominguez and Pancho Dominguez, he is recuperating. The acute period, it is said, has now passed, as he had only one serious wound—in the stomach. It is said that the other injuries in his jaw and back caused only slight injuries, as no bones were fractured.

CABINET RUMORS.

Visits of Sherman and Allison to Mr. McKinley.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 6.—Gossip connecting Senator Sherman's name with the Secretaryship of State under the McKinley administration was revived here today when it was stated that upon invitation Senator Sherman would visit Major McKinley at his home within the next few days. It is generally believed here that upon this occasion Senator Sherman will be formally tendered the State portfolio, and that he will accept.

PHILADELPHIA, Jan. 4.—Senator William B. Allison will not be a member of President McKinley's cabinet. The Senator so announced today while passing through here on his way to Washington. The Senator said he would be glad to accept a portfolio if offered him, but that he knew it would not be offered. A long conference